

Message

---

**From:** Strauss, Alexis [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=848EB244E96A4F04A105967EA264320B-ASTRAUSS]  
**Sent:** 8/25/2016 4:32:29 PM  
**To:** Manzanilla, Enrique [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=0482b3cc383348b887a1800bc40c0a72-EMANZANI]  
**Subject:** FW: Agenda for the now canceled meeting about the Hunters Point Shipyard

?

---

**From:** Bradley Angel [mailto:bradley@greenaction.org]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 25, 2016 9:32 AM  
**To:** Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>; dohirsch@ucsc.edu  
**Cc:** LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>; Herrera, Angeles <Herrera.Angeles@epa.gov>; Flora E. Lu <Floralu@ucsc.edu>; Marie Harrison <marieH@greenaction.org>; Reyes, Deldi <Reyes.Deldi@epa.gov>; Strauss, Alexis <Strauss.Alexis@epa.gov>; Dr. Raymond Tompkins <rtomp@sbcglobal.net>; rkintz@dtsc.ca.gov  
**Subject:** Agenda for the now canceled meeting about the Hunters Point Shipyard

John,

I am surprised, perplexed and frankly disappointed at your interpretation of what today's meeting (which I know is now canceled) was supposed to be about.

It clearly was set up to try to resolve the differing perspectives from EPA and the UCSC program about the EPA cleanup standards at the shipyard. While we certainly wanted to discuss identifying common goals to ensure the cleanup would be protective, the main purpose of this meeting was indeed to try to resolve the issues raised by the UCSC program in the spring.

I also don't understand why the meeting got canceled twenty minutes after you sent the email about the agenda and confirming the meeting could still take place.

The last minute email about the meeting agenda from EPA, combined with the Navy's lack of transparency and stonewalling, combined with Tetra Tech still working at the shipyard despite the apparent falsification of soil samples, raises enormous concerns about what is really going on.

EPA is obligated to comply with environmental justice mandates, and right now we do not see that happening.

Bradley

On 8/24/2016 6:39 PM, Chesnutt, John wrote:

Bradley and Daniel,

Thanks for getting back to us. Lily is out on leave this afternoon, so she forwarded your messages. Our intention in meeting face to face with you tomorrow is to hear your overall concerns and establish some common goals on how we can address them and move forward to ensure the cleanup at Hunters Point continues to be protective. From the below emails, it seems like you are more interested in a point by point debate on many aspects of UCSC's original "critique", which frankly, we have discussed in various forums with the Hunters Point community over the last several months, and the dialogue seems to have progressed to remedy protectiveness. We value meeting face to face to address protectiveness issues, but if your remaining intent is to get specific answers to each of your points, then EPA feels it is more productive to provide written responses to each of your points. When I have an opportunity to discuss with Lily, we can give you a timeframe for our response and if upon reviewing them, you still want to discuss them further, we can arrange a meeting then.

So if our original intent for tomorrow's face to face meeting is amenable to you, then we are more than happy to travel to UCSC and meet with you tomorrow.

In response to your question about recording the meeting. No, we would not like the meeting recorded. We believe there are other ways to document our discussions and followup.

Thanks, John

John Chesnutt  
Superfund Section Chief  
415-972-3005

---

**From:** LEE, LILY  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 24, 2016 4:50 PM  
**To:** Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Agenda for tomorrow's mtg?

**From:** Bradley Angel [<mailto:bradley@greenaction.org>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 24, 2016 2:33 PM  
**To:** LEE, LILY <[LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV](mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV)>; Daniel Hirsch <[dohirsch@ucsc.edu](mailto:dohirsch@ucsc.edu)>; Flora E. Lu <[Floralu@ucsc.edu](mailto:Floralu@ucsc.edu)>  
**Subject:** Re: Agenda for tomorrow's mtg?

I want Dan to chime in, but let's start with the point by point review of UCSC's critique and sort that out. We also want to talk about the Navy's evasive and non-answers to our questions about Tetra Tech...and why EPA at this point must step in fully rather than pointing us to the Navy.

ALSO...WOULD IT BE OK IF THE MEETING WAS RECORDED? We think that would be helpful to document the points of agreement and disagreement to avoid different interpretations of the discussion. I am sure we all hope we can move forward after this with a clear understanding of the issues and what happened at the site.  
Thanks.

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Daniel Hirsch <[dohirsch@ucsc.edu](mailto:dohirsch@ucsc.edu)>  
**Date:** August 24, 2016 at 4:36:06 PM PDT  
**To:** "LEE, LILY" <[LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV](mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV)>  
**Cc:** Flora Lu <[floralu@ucsc.edu](mailto:floralu@ucsc.edu)>, Bradley Angel <[bradley@greenaction.org](mailto:bradley@greenaction.org)>  
**Subject:** Re: Agenda for tomorrow's mtg?

Hi Lily,

Thanks for asking. Since we have been requesting this meeting since February, we want to use the time as efficiently as possible.

We want to go, issue by issue, through our concerns about the cleanup standards that were approved for Hunters Point and the basis for EPA's concurrence in them. We want to address specifically whether those cleanup standards meet or are at variance with EPA's guidance. To the extent they do not meet EPA guidance, we want to understand the basis for EPA's approval of them.

For each issue, we want to understand clearly whether EPA agrees with our analysis. If it does not, we want to know the precise basis for the disagreement and discuss it.

We suggest the following order for the agenda:

1. Release criteria for structures, equipment and waste.
  - a. The use of a 25 millirem/year standard. Does that meet EPA guidance?
  - b. The use of the former Atomic Energy Commission's 1974 Regulatory Guide 1.86. Does that meet EPA guidance?
  - c. The use of RESRAD-Build. Does that meet EPA guidance.
  - d. The basis for EPA's assertion that the Navy merely relied on these standards to show compliance with other agencies' requirements but that the cleanup standards employed were EPA's.
  - e. The risk level from the release criteria used for structures, equipment and waste, as calculated by EPA's Building PRG calculator.
  - f. The fate of contaminated materials released using these release criteria from these structures or in equipment and waste.
2. Release criteria for soil
  - a. The use of PRGs from a 1991 draft EPA document no longer in use, rather than current EPA PRGs.
3. The post-remediation reviews transmitted to us earlier this year.
  - a. The use of averaging and whether that is in accord with EPA guidance.
  - b. The use of incremental versus actual concentrations and whether that is in accord with EPA guidance.
  - c. The use of only a few radionuclides, and no summing of risk and whether that is in accord with EPA guidance.
4. The various assertions by EPA to the news media that our analysis is incorrect.
5. Transparency issues, in particular the refusal of the Navy to make public key documents about the cleanup and the need for EPA to assure those records are publicly accessible.

Also, could you send us email addresses for the people who will not be physically present but will be on by phone, so we can, if needed, email them documents we are looking at in the meeting?

See you tomorrow.

Daniel Hirsch  
Director  
Program on Environmental and Nuclear Policy  
College Ten  
University of California at Santa Cruz

On Aug 24, 2016, at 12:07 PM, LEE, LILY <[LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV](mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV)> wrote:

Dear Dan and Bradley,

Did you have a particular agenda order in mind? If not, then based on the topics we talked about in previous meetings, including the June mtg we had at the Greenaction office, could I suggest this simple outline?

1. Introductions
2. EJ Task Force summary of concerns
3. EPA discussion of cleanup standards
  - a. EPA review of cleanup reports
  - b. EPA review of exposure scenarios
4. EPA discussion about Tetra Tech
5. EJ Task Force followup questions and comments

But we're flexible. We'll be available for the 2 hours that you requested.

Thank you again for hosting.

- Lily

Lily Lee  
Cleanup Project Manager  
Superfund Division  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9  
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518  
[www.epa.gov/region9/superfund](http://www.epa.gov/region9/superfund)